

October 1, 2013 LUEAAC Agenda Comments

Comments on the Newport Beach Land Use Element Amendment Advisory Committee agenda from:
Jim Mosher (jimmosher@yahoo.com), 2210 Private Road, Newport Beach 92660 (949-548-6229)

2) Approval of Minutes (September 17, 2013, Meeting)

The following minor corrections are suggested --

1. Page 1:

- a. Location: “~~Oasis~~ OASIS Senior Center ...”
- b. Item IV.a, sentence 3: “Gary ~~Picker~~ Pickett, representing Ardell, ...”

2. Page 2:

- a. Paragraph 3: “Gary ~~Picket~~ Pickett, representing Ardell, ...”
- b. Item b.ii. **Saunders:**
 - i. “... including 1.2 M ~~SF~~ or of office and ...”
 - ii. The following “sentence” -- “(An increase of 10,840 trips) (4,192 are attributed to residential) (13,296 office trips)”-- seems notes rather than minutes and makes little sense as presented. Is 13,296 an increase or a new total?
- c. Paragraph 3 from end: “(ii) Patrick ~~Strater~~ Strader representing Saunders gave an overview, ...”

3. Page 3:

- a. Paragraph 2: “McDermott described potential options for moving forward through TDR ...” [TDR = Transfer of Development Rights ? – might be helpful to spell out what it stands for]
- b. Item (iv): “... and an increase of FAR ~~of to~~ [?] approximately 2.0 FAR. Their intent is to stay trip neutral on this site.”
- c. Item d.: “The Irvine Company – Requested removal of 357 residential units at Newport ~~ridge~~ Ridge.”

4. Page 4:

- a. Last sentence: “... in the agenda binder and on the ~~City Hall Bulletin Board~~ electronic bulletin board located in the entrance of the Council Chambers at 100 Civic Center Drive.”

5) Finalize Land Use Changes to be Considered in Environmental Impact Report

1. The pre-meeting handout ("Attachment No. 3 : Potential Land Use Changes Chart") has what appears to be a typo in the footnote at the bottom of the first page where it says *"Property owner has revised original request of a **1,200** hotel room reduction to retain 25 hotel rooms."* I believe the original request was for a **1,022** room reduction, which would have left zero remaining hotel room entitlement.
2. This document, like those that have preceded it, describes traffic impacts in terms of "ADT" which I believe stands for "Annual Daily Traffic." Since the Charter Section 423 voter approval requirement is based on the quite different "Peak Hour Trips" combined with 80 percent of previous non-voter-approved increases in the preceding 10 years, it is very difficult to assess which of the proposed General Plan changes would, by themselves, require voter approval. City staff presumably keeps track of how much new development is currently allowable in each statistical area without a Section 423 vote. It would seem helpful to relate that information to the present chart in such a way that the Committee could see which proposals actually need to be placed on the ballot, and which do not.
3. I continue to have heard no explanation to the Committee, nor discussion by the Committee, of how the proposed new Newport Center/ Fashion Island development entitlements (first item on page 2 of Attachment No. 3) benefits the City's residents, or how it would likely be used.